

EXHIBIT I

PILLSBURY & LEVINSON, LLP
The Transamerica Pyramid
600 Montgomery Street, 31st Floor · San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Philip L. Pillsbury, Jr. (SBN 72261)
Vedica Puri (SBN 176252)
2 Eric K. Larson (SBN 142791)
PILLSBURY & LEVINSON, LLP
3 The Transamerica Pyramid
4 600 Montgomery Street, 31st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
5 Telephone: (415) 433-8000
Facsimile: (415) 433-4816
6 E-mail: ppillsbury@pillsburylevinson.com
vpuri@pillsburylevinson.com
7 rlarson@pillsburylevinson.com

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
9 COPART INC.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 OAKLAND DIVISION

13 COPART INC.,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 CRUM & FORSTER INDEMNITY
17 COMPANY, UNITED STATES FIRE
18 INSURANCE COMPANY, and DOES 1-10,
Inclusive,

19 Defendants.

20 AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION

) Case No. C 07 2684 CW-EDL

) **PLAINTIFF COPART, INC.'S**
) **OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT**
) **USFIC'S FIRST SET OF ENTRY (SITE**
) **INSPECTION) REQUESTS**

) Action Filed: March 20, 2007
) Trial Date: November 10, 2008

22 Plaintiff Copart, Inc. ("Copart") objects to defendant United States Fire Insurance
23 Company's ("USFIC") request under FRCP, Rule 34 that "consultants retained by USFIC" be
24 permitted onto ten designated yards "so that the consultants may inspect, measure, survey, or
25 photograph the buildings or structures located there," on the following grounds:

26 1. The request is vague and ambiguous as to the identity and expertise of the
27 unnamed consultants and the nature, purpose and extent of the proposed inspections,
28 measurements, surveys or photographs.

PILLSBURY & LEVINSON, LLP
 The Transamerica Pyramid
 600 Montgomery Street, 31st Floor · San Francisco, CA 94111

2. The requested inspections are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The requested inspections are, Copart assumes, to be conducted in order to formulate opinions as to the present values of yards and buildings thereon, although this is not readily apparent from the face of the request. The appraised value of the properties today has no relevance to the claims or counterclaims asserted in this case even assuming the viability of USFIC's negligent misrepresentation theory. Indeed, the Court, in a January 15, 2008 discovery hearing stated that "I don't think present values are relevant."

3. Further, any alleged discrepancy between present values and past stated values is not relevant to the negligent misrepresentation claim, in any event, because such past statements are opinions as to future events and cannot constitute actionable representations as a matter of law.

4. The requested inspections are overly intrusive and burdensome and would constitute an unreasonable interference in Copart's daily operations at those yards with no discernible purpose for the inspections. Further, Copart has offered to make available to USFIC documentary records that will show purchase price, construction expenditures and renovation expenditures for every yard. Thus, there is available a far less burdensome method to provide to USFIC what is more probative information (notwithstanding the ultimate irrelevance of that information to this action).

Dated: April 22, 2008

PILLSBURY & LEVINSON, LLP

By: 

Vedica Puri
 Eric K. Larson
 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 COPART INC.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare that I am a citizen of the United States; my business address is The Transamerica Pyramid, 600 Montgomery Street, 31st Floor, San Francisco, California 94111; I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco; I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the within action.

On April 22, 2008, I served the foregoing document(s) described as

(1) PLAINTIFF COPART, INC.'S OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT USFIC'S FIRST SET OF ENTRY (SITE INSPECTION) REQUESTS

on the interested party(ies) in this action by placing ☐ the original ☒ a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Jess B. Milikan
Samuel H. Ruby
Judith A. Whitehouse
BULLIVANT HOUSER BAILEY PC
601 California Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94108
Tel. 415-352-2700
Fax 415-352-2701


☒ BY MAIL: I caused such envelope(s), fully prepaid, to be placed in the United States mail at San Francisco, California. I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the United States Postal Service the same day, with postage thereon fully prepaid, at San Francisco, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date on postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ BY FACSIMILE: In addition to service by mail, on this date I transmitted a copy of the foregoing document(s) to the facsimile number(s) shown above.

☐ BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I caused such envelope(s) to be delivered by WESTERN MESSENGER, a local San Francisco messenger service, by hand on the same day, addressed to the interested party(ies) at the address(es) set forth above.

☒ STATE: I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on April 22, 2008 at San Francisco, California.


Sandra Bush

PILLSBURY & LEVINSON, LLP
The Transamerica Pyramid
600 Montgomery Street, 31st Floor - San Francisco, CA 94111

EXHIBIT J

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

COPY

COPART, INC,

PLAINTIFF,

VERSUS

CRUM AND FOERSTER

INDEMNITY COMPANY, ET AL.,

DEFENDANTS.

CASE NO. C07-2684EDL

JANUARY 15, 2008

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR PLAINTIFF:

PILLSBURY AND LEVINSON, LLP
BY: ERIC K. LARSON, ESQ.
THE TRANSAMERICA PYRAMID
800 MONTGOMERY STREET 31ST FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111

FOR DEFENDANTS:

BULLIVANT HOUSER BAILY PC
BY: JUDITH A. WHITEHOUSE, ATTORNEY AT LAW
601 CALIFORNIA STREET SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94108

REPORTED BY:

JUANITA GONZALEZ

CSR NO. 3003

1 THE CLERK: CALLING C-07-2684, COPART, INC. VERSUS CRUM
2 AND FOERSTER INDENMNITY COMPANY, ET AL.

3 YOUR APPEARANCES, PLEASE.

4 MR. LARSON: ERIC LARSON FOR ON BEHALF OF COPART, INC.

5 MS. WHITEHOUSE: JUDITH WHITEHOUSE FOR UNITED STATES
6 FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD AFTERNOON.

8 WELL, I AM CONCERNED ABOUT WHETHER THERE WAS AN
9 ADEQUATE MEET AND CONFER THAT WAS REALLY CARRIED OUT. I MEAN,
10 THE DEFENDANT DOESN'T REALLY RESPOND TO THAT, BUT IT'S NOT
11 IRRELEVANT, THE SUBJECT. YOU KNOW -- THERE HAS TO BE AN
12 ADEQUATE MEET AND CONFER BEFORE YOU CAN BRING A MOTION.

13 MR. LARSON: SHE IS THE MOVING PARTY.

14 THE COURT: SORRY.

15 MS. WHITEHOUSE: I BELIEVE THAT THE MEETING THAT
16 MR. LARSON AND MR. RUBY OF MY OFFICE HAD -- I HAVE TO REFER TO
17 THE DATES -- BUT ON THE TELEPHONE -- IN WHICH THEY DISCUSSED THE
18 ISSUE ABOUT THE INSUFFICIENCY OF THE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND THE
19 NEED, THE POTENTIAL NEED FOR ADDITIONAL -- SOME ADDITIONAL
20 EXPLANATION OF PRIVILEGES CLAIMED ON THE PRIVILEGE LOG. I
21 BELIEVE THAT WAS IN OCTOBER OF THIS YEAR, AND WAS FOLLOWED UP BY
22 AN E-MAIL FROM MR. RUBY TO MR. LARSON SAYING, "THESE ARE THE
23 SPECIFIC ITEMS OF THE PRIVILEGE LOG THAT WE NEED SOME
24 INFORMATION ABOUT".

25 THE MEET AND CONFER --

1 THE COURT: WELL, I GUESS, JUST LOOKING AT IT IN
2 HINDSIGHT, THEN ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS WERE SENT. THE MOTION WAS
3 ALREADY ON FILE. AND THEY APPARENTLY WERE UNDER THE
4 IMPRESSION THAT IT WAS STILL ONGOING.

5 MR. LARSON: THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS, AFTER MY MEET
6 AND CONFER WITH MR. RUBY, I THEN SENT OUT A LETTER SETTING OUT
7 OUR POSITION AND ANSWERING A BUNCH OF HIS QUESTIONS, ON THE
8 15TH, AND A MOTION GOT FILED AFTER THAT WITHOUT A RESPONSE TO MY
9 LETTER. IT LOOKED LIKE WE WENT BACK TO SQUARE ONE, THOSE MEET
10 AND CONFER DISCUSSIONS THAT NEVER HAPPENED.

11 WE WERE AT A LOSS AT THAT POINT TRYING TO FIGURE OUT
12 WHAT USFIC WAS REALLY LOOKING FOR IN THE WAY OF DOCUMENTS. I
13 THOUGHT WE NARROWED IT DOWN TO A REASONABLE READING OF THE
14 DOCUMENT REQUEST. WE WENT AND MADE INQUIRY OF THE CLIENT AS TO
15 WHETHER THOSE DOCUMENTS EXISTED OR I SHOULD SAY, ANY MORE
16 DOCUMENTS EXISTED, BECAUSE WE PRODUCED QUITE A LARGE NUMBER OF
17 DOCUMENTS, AND WE FOUND OUT THEY DIDN'T, AND I ENDED MY
18 RESPONSES ACCORDINGLY AND THEN GOT A MOTION ASKING -- I
19 THINK -- IT'S NOT CLEAR TO ME -- FOR A WHOLE OTHER UNIVERSE OF
20 DOCUMENTS.

21 THE COURT: I AM GOING TO GO AHEAD AND DECIDE THIS
22 MOTION, BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO DEFER IT AND HAVE IT COME BACK.
23 THAT'S THE ONLY REASON. I'M NOT CONVINCED THERE WAS AN
24 ADEQUATE, COMPLETE MEET AND CONFER. CERTAINLY THE OTHER SIDE
25 DIDN'T THINK SO. SO IN THE FUTURE, I DON'T WANT THAT TO HAPPEN

1 AGAIN.

2 MS. WHITEHOUSE: I UNDERSTAND.

3 THE COURT: YOU'RE NOT SUPPOSED TO COME RUNNING IN HERE
4 UNTIL YOU FULLY -- A LOT OF THESE THINGS YOU SHOULD HAVE BEEN
5 ABLE -- THEY'RE THE KIND OF ISSUES, WITH THE POSSIBLE EXCEPTION
6 OF THE PRIVILEGE ONE, THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN CAPABLE OF BEING
7 RESOLVED WITHOUT COMING TO COURT. AS TO THAT -- ALL RIGHT.
8 YOU'RE STILL DISPUTING REQUEST 15, DOCUMENTS ON THE CONSTRUCTION
9 OF BUILDINGS THAT ARE AT 105.

10 MR. LARSON: I PRODUCED THOSE DOCUMENTS BEFORE THE
11 HEARING.

12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO THAT'S MOOT.

13 MS. WHITEHOUSE: WELL, I HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO REVIEW
14 THEM, BUT THEY HAVE BEEN PRODUCED.

15 MR. LARSON: 300 PAGES. I DON'T EXPECT HER TO --

16 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN 18, LIST OF SCHEDULES OF
17 REAL PROPERTY ASSETS PREPARED OR MAINTAINED BY YOU FOR
18 ACCOUNTING AND TAX PURPOSES SINCE JULY 1, 2003. DEFENDANT SEEMS
19 TO BE CORRECT THERE IS A COUNTERCLAIM FOR NEGLIGENT
20 REPRESENTATION THAT WOULD ENCOMPASS A BROADER RANGE THAN THE
21 INITIAL COMPLAINT. I WOULD AGREE WITH THEM THEY DON'T HAVE TO
22 JUST ACCEPT PLAINTIFF'S REPRESENTATION THAT THE DOCUMENT IS
23 IRRELEVANT. IT SEEMS THAT THE DEPRECIATION VERSUS REPLACEMENT
24 VALUE, SOME CIRCUMSTANCES ARE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT AND SOME
25 CIRCUMSTANCES THEY DO RIGHT TO EACH OTHER. I'D BE INCLINED TO

1 HAVE YOU PRODUCE THAT. I'M NOT SURE WHAT THERE IS.

2 MR. LARSON: THERE IS ONE CALLED FIXED ASSET LIST, AND
3 AT THIS POINT, THE VERSION I HAVE SEEN IS FROM THIS YEAR. I
4 DON'T EVEN KNOW IF THERE ARE HISTORICAL VERSIONS OF IT. I THINK
5 IT MAY BE A LIVING DOCUMENT. IN FACT, THE BUILDING THAT'S AT
6 ISSUE HERE, YARD 105 IN FLORIDA, WAS DESTROYED BY HURRICANE
7 WILMA, IS NOT EVEN ON THAT LIST BECAUSE IT'S BEEN DESTROYED.

8 THE COURT: THE COUNTERCLAIM I GUESS IS IS BROADER?
9 YOU'RE COUNTERCLAIMING AS TO OTHER BUILDINGS AS WELL?

10 MS. WHITEHOUSE: YES.

11 THE COURT: WHAT ABOUT THE TIME FRAME, WHAT'S THE
12 RELEVANT TIME FRAME? I THINK THE IDEA THERE IS TO GET PAST THE
13 HURRICANES THAT STIMULATED THIS ENTIRE SITUATION AND GET BACK TO
14 SEE WHAT OTHER VALUES MAY HAVE BEEN MISSTATED.

15 MS. WHITEHOUSE: PRIOR?

16 THE COURT: IN OTHER WORDS, PRIOR TO THE DISPUTE
17 ARISING, NOT TO THE PRESENT, RIGHT?

18 MS. WHITEHOUSE: RIGHT.

19 MR. LARSON: MAY I MAKE ONE MORE POINT? THE NEGLIGENT
20 MISREPRESENTATION CLAIM, WHICH IS WHAT THEY FOCUS ON, AT BEST,
21 ASSUMING THEY WIN ON THAT, WHAT THEY WOULD GET ARE THE PREMIUMS
22 IT WOULD HAVE CHARGED, OTHERWISE WOULD HAVE CHARGED FOR YARD
23 105; SO ALL THESE OTHER HUNDREDS OF YARDS COULD NOT BE RELEVANT
24 EVEN IF YOU DO COMPEL THE PRODUCTION OF THIS FIXED ASSETS LIST
25 OR ANY OTHER DOCUMENTS TODAY. THEY HAVE TO BE LIMITED TO YARD

1 105. THAT IS ANOTHER ISSUE I THOUGHT WE HAD GOTTEN BEYOND IN
2 OUR MEET AND CONFER EFFORTS, AND WE SORT OF GOT BACK TO SQUARE
3 ONE WHERE IT SEEMS LIKE THEY ARE LOOKING FOR EVERY ILLUSTRATION
4 IN MY OPPOSITION.

5 THE COURT: PLAINLY, I AGREE WITH THAT, BUT PART OF
6 THAT IS THE DATE. I DON'T UNDERSTAND ENOUGH ABOUT WHAT YOU JUST
7 SAID, AND IT WASN'T CLEAR IN THE PAPERS AS TO WHY ANY OF IT
8 WOULD BE IRRELEVANT, EVEN THOUGH THEY SAY THEIR CLAIM GOES
9 BEYOND. SO I DO THINK THERE IS A TIME CUT-OFF, SO THE TIME
10 CUT-OFF SHOULD BE WHAT? IN OTHER WORDS, I DON'T THINK PRESENT
11 VALUES ARE RELEVANT. I DON'T THINK YOU'RE ARGUING THAT. SO
12 WHAT'S THE DATE?

13 MR. LARSON: ASSUMING IT'S RELEVANT, IT WOULD HAVE TO
14 BE BEFORE THE HURRICANE, OCTOBER 2, 2005.

15 THE COURT: IT'S NOT STAMPED IN MY MEMORY. I DON'T
16 KNOW IF IT'S RELEVANT OR NOT, BUT I DON'T THINK IT'S
17 SUFFICIENTLY SHOWN THAT IT WASN'T IN THE PAPERS THEMSELVES. IF
18 YOU HAVE THAT DOCUMENT AS OF THAT DATE OR BEFORE, PROVIDE IT.
19 IF IT'S ONLY CURRENT AND IT HAS NOTHING THAT DATES BACK TO THOSE
20 DATES, THEN YOU CAN JUST REPRESENT THAT AND NOT PROVIDE IT.

21 MR. LARSON: JUST AS TO YARD 105?

22 MS. WHITEHOUSE: NO.

23 THE COURT: NO. YOU SAY IT'S A DOCUMENT. HOW LONG ARE
24 WE TALKING ABOUT?

25 MR. LARSON: IT'S COUPLE OF HUNDRED PAGES.

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELL, IT'S NOT LIMITED, FOR THE
2 REASONS I SAID. I DON'T THINK YOU MADE THAT ARGUMENT. I DON'T
3 KNOW WHETHER IT'S RIGHT OR WRONG. I WOULD HAVE TO LOOK AT IT
4 MUCH MORE DEEPLY THAN WAS BIEFED IN THE PAPERS.

5 SO THEN AS TO REQUEST 19, 20 AND 21, WHICH IS MORE TO
6 DO WITH REPLACEMENT COST. THE DEFENDANT IS REALLY ONLY SAYING
7 VERY PERTINENT DOCUMENTS ARE USED TO CALCULATE THE VALUES THAT
8 WERE REPORTED TO DEFENDANT, WHICH SEEMS TO ME THE ONLY THING
9 THAT MIGHT BE WORTHWHILE. I DON'T KNOW TO WHAT EXTENT THERE ARE
10 ANY SUCH THINGS.

11 MR. LARSON: I DON'T THINK THERE ARE, YOUR HONOR.
12 CERTAINLY NOT SAVED IN A SYSTEMATIC WAY.

13 THE COURT: I MEAN -- WELL, DOCUMENTS THAT WERE USED TO
14 CALCULATE VALUES REPORTED TO THE DEFENDANT, CERTAINLY AS TO THE
15 PROPERTY OF YARD 105, WOULD BE RELEVANT, OBVIOUSLY. HAVE YOU
16 LOOKED FOR THOSE?

17 MR. LARSON: WELL, FOR YARD 105, WE HAVE GIVEN THEM
18 EVERY SHRED OF DOCUMENT WE HAVE. WE'VE GIVEN THEM ALL THE
19 INVOICES INCLUDED IN THE DOCUMENTS I JUST GAVE TODAY, EVERY
20 CONSTRUCTION INVOICE GOING BACK TO THE TIME OF PURCHASE OF YARD
21 105.

22 THE COURT: WELL, I THINK YOUR REQUEST IS JUST -- IT'S
23 DISPROPORTIONATE AND OF TANGENTIAL RELEVANCE AT MOST. UNLESS YOU
24 CAN NARROW IT SOME WAY THAT MAKES SENSE, I WOULD DENY IT.

25 MS. WHITEHOUSE: NOT KNOWING WHAT HAS BEEN PRODUCED

1 TODAY, I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT I'VE GOT.

2 THE COURT: I'LL DENY IT WITHOUT PREJUDICE. LOOK AT
3 WHAT YOU'VE GOT NOW. IF YOU ARE STILL UNSATISFIED, HAVE A REAL
4 MEET AND CONFER, AND AT MOST, SEEK SOMETHING FAR MORE NARROW
5 THAN YOU ASKED FOR, BECAUSE IT'S BROAD.

6 NOW, AS TO THE PRIVILEGE LOG, I'M NOT INCLINED TO THINK
7 THAT THERE IS ADEQUATE PRIVILEGE SHOWN, CERTAINLY ON THE LOG
8 ITSELF, BECAUSE IT'S SO LONG BEFORE. IT'S NON-ATTORNEYS, AND
9 ALTHOUGH THAT BY ITSELF ISN'T SUFFICIENT, THERE IS A BIG ELAPSE
10 OF TIME. COMMUNICATION WAS ORIGINALLY TRANSMITTED ON
11 AUGUST 28, 2006 AND IT WAS ALMOST A YEAR LATER THAT IT WAS
12 TRANSMITTED TO COUNSEL, AS I UNDERSTAND IT.

13 MR. LARSON: THAT'S NOT TRUE. THAT IS A CONCLUSION
14 THEY DREW FROM -- THERE IS A DATE ON IT OF JULY 31, 2007. THAT
15 IS ACTUALLY FROM THE VICE PRESIDENT OF FINANCE TO HIS ASSISTANT,
16 WAS THE JULY 31, 2007 DATE. THAT'S THE WRONG DATE I HAD IN THE
17 PRIVILEGE LOG TO BEGIN WITH, BECAUSE THAT WAS THE DATE AT THE
18 TOP OF THE E-MAIL.

19 THE COURT: IT WAS A MISTAKE IN THE PRIVILEGE LOG?

20 MR. LARSON: YES.

21 THE COURT: HAVE YOU CORRECTED -- NOBODY GAVE ME THAT
22 PRIVILEGE LOG, BY THE WAY, WHICH SEEMS LIKE I WOULD NEED THAT.

23 MR. LARSON: ALSO, YOU WERE ASSIGNED THIS CASE AFTER WE
24 DID THE PRIVILEGE LOG, AND LOOKING AT YOUR STANDING ORDER, I
25 DON'T THINK IT'S AS DETAILED AS THE COURT WOULD LIKE.

1 ONE OF THE ALTERNATIVES THAT USFIC YOU GAVE IN THEIR
2 REPLIES -- AT LEAST TRIED TO MAKE A SHOWING INTO THE AMENDED
3 PRIVILEGE LOG-- I WOULD BE WILLING TO GIVE THAT A SHOT. IF IT
4 DOESN'T RESOLVE IT AT THAT POINT, I THINK WE CAN PROBABLY JUST
5 GIVE YOU -- IT'S A SINGLE PAGE -- GIVE YOU A LETTER IN-CAMERA.

6 THE COURT: I THINK THAT MAKES SENSE. GO AHEAD AND
7 REVISE YOUR PRIVILEGE LOG TO COMPLY WITH MY STANDING ORDER. AND
8 IF IT APPEARS TO BE PRIVILEGED, DON'T SUBMIT IT TO ME. IF YOU
9 HAVE A REALLY, TRUE, GENUINE, GOOD FAITH DISPUTE, NONETHELESS,
10 THEN SUBMIT IT IN-CAMERA.

11 HOW QUICKLY CAN THAT BE DONE?

12 MR LARSON: A WEEK FROM TOMORROW.

13 THE COURT: FINE.

14 ANYTHING FURTHER?

15 LET'S SEE. IT'S YOUR MOTION. WILL YOU PREPARE AN
16 ORDER?

17 MS. WHITEHOUSE: CERTAINLY.

18 THE COURT: GIVE IT TO ME BY THE END OF THE WEEK.

19 THANK YOU.
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE AND CORRECT
TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HELD IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

JUANITA GONZALEZ

CSR NO. 3003

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE AND CORRECT
10 TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HELD IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 JUANITA GONZALEZ

21 CSR NO. 3003
22
23
24
25

EXHIBIT K

	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
1													
2													
3													
4													
	COPE INFORMATION												
5	Sprinklers Yes / No	Approx. Sq. Ft.	Alarm System Yes / No	Age of Building	# of Bldgs.	# of Acres	Owned or Leased						
6	Yes	8,800	Yes	1985	3	17	Leased						
7	Yes	12,800	Yes	2005	1	38	Owned						
8	Yes	900	Yes	1987	1	5	Leased						
9	No	10,950	Yes	1996	3	20	Leased						
10						30	Both						
11	No	2,700	Yes	1985	1	15	Owned						
12	No	7,200	Yes	2004	1	14	Leased						
13	No	31,400	Yes	2001	4	30	Both						
14	No	12,000	Yes	?	3	38	Both						
15	Yes	2,960	Yes	1994	2	11	Both						
16	No	18,000	Yes	2003	1	158	Owned						
17	No	27,000	Yes	1986, ?	7	103	Owned						
18	No	11,200	Yes	2001, 1980	2	22	Leased						
19	No	8,964	Yes	2001	3	44	Leased						
20	Yes	5,600	Yes	1994	2	71	Both						
21	Yes	37,000	Yes	?	3	15	Leased						
22	No	9,700	Yes	?	2	68	Owned						
23	No	20,873	Yes	2001, approx 1975	2	36	Owned						
24	No	6,700	Yes	1999	1	30	Owned						
25	No	10,762	Yes	1985, 1952	2	45	Both						
26	No	14,623	Yes	1992, 2003, 1982	3	53	Both						
27	No	7,200	Yes	2005	1	40	Owned						
28	No	20,400	Yes	1989, 1970, 1970	3	45	Owned						
29	No	10,000	Yes	1991, approx 1930	2	25	Owned						
30	Yes	9,200	Yes	2003	1	33	Owned						
31	No	27,300	Yes	?	4	44	Both						
32	Yes	41,000	Yes	late 1960's, late 1970's	4	28	Owned						
33	No	87,720	Yes	2002	1	61	Leased						
34	No	8,195	Yes	?	3	34	Both						
35	No	12,150	Yes	2000, 1995	2	50	Leased						
36	Yes	8,000	Yes	1986, ?	1	26	Leased						
37	No	8,900	Yes	?	1	39	Owned						
38						18	Leased						
39	No	4,000	Yes	1992	1	17	Leased						
40	No	11,500	Yes	2000	3	51	Owned						

CPT001200
CONFIDENTIAL

EXHIBIT L

180
01/17/08
11:26:10

Copart Inc.
Fixed Assets Master List
By Location
As of July 31, 2005

Item Number	Description	Yard	Date Acquired	Date Disposed	Life Months	Dep. Metho	Original Cost	Accum. Amort.	Net Book Value

00070070	West Palm		04/01/00						

2010 Land									
00071984	Land - Parcel A (Yard 70)	70	03/01/00			00			Dollar amount redacted.
00071992	Land - Parcel B (Yard 70)	70	03/01/00			00			
00072004	Land - Parcel C (Yard 70)	70	03/01/00			00			

2010 Land									

2020 Computer Equipment									
00072119	00072119 CABLE YARD 70	70	03/31/00		60	01			
00072581	00072581 PERLE S94E CNTRLR W/1 TWINAX	70	03/27/00		60	01			
00072590	00072590 COMPUTER EQUIPMENT FOR YARD	70	03/31/00		60	01			
00073066	00073066 EPSON PRINTER & STAND	70	04/12/00	06/30/05	60	01			
00073074	00073074 EPSON PRINTER	70	04/25/00	06/30/05	60	01			
00074405	00074405 PENTIUM SVST W/MONITOR	70	05/31/00		60	01			
00074528	00074528 FUJI SCANNER 620C	70	05/31/00	04/30/07	60	01			
00074536	00074536 NETWORK PRINTER MEMORY CABLE	70	05/31/00		60	01			
00075416	00075416 PENTIUM SYSTEM W/15" MONITOR	70	05/16/00		60	01			
00083227	00083227 CISCO ROUTERS	70	05/31/02	12/31/05	60	01			
00102437	00102437 EPSON DFX5000 PRINTER	70	08/30/02	06/30/05	36	01			
00102832	00102832 EPSON PRINTER	70	09/30/02	06/30/05	36	01			

2020 Computer Equipment									
					672	01			

2025 Computer Equipment Maint									
00111675	00111675 CABLE YARD 70 - NEW BLDG	70	05/30/03		60	01			Dollar amount redacted.
00112230	00112230 CABLE YARD 70 - INS. OFFICE	70	06/10/03		60	01			
00115490	00115490 12 CUI ET 2000 TERMINALS	70	10/31/03		60	01			

2025 Computer Equipment Maint									
					180	01			

2030 Leasehold Improvements									
00083475	00083475 FENCE	70	02/28/01		60	01			
00083483	00083483 GRADING/PAVING	70	02/28/01		60	01			
00083491	00083491 LANDSCAPE	70	02/28/01		60	01			
00108054	00108054 SITE WORK	70	01/31/03		60	01			
00116370	00116370 GATE OPERATOR	70	10/31/03		60	01			
00116388	00116388 INSURANCE OFFICE RENOVATION	70	10/31/03		60	01			

2030 Leasehold Improvements									
					360	01			

2035 Leasehold Improvements Maint									
00126421	00126421 PLUMBING & BLDG REPAIRS	70	06/30/04		60	01			Dollar amount redacted.

2035 Leasehold Improvements Maint									
					60	01			

2040 Buildings									
00071693	00071693 METAL BUILDING DR THRU	70	02/29/00		480	01			Dollar amount redacted.
00071941	00071941 Buildings on Parcel A (2)	70	03/01/00		480	01			
00071950	00071950 Building on Parcel B	70	03/01/00		480	01			
00083459	00083459 BUILDING RENOVATIONS	70	02/28/01		480	01			

2040 Buildings									
					1,920	01			

126410 ASSET PERIOD2005		Copart Inc. Fixed Assets Master List By Location As of July 31, 2005				181 01/17/08 11:26:10			
Item Number	Description	Yard	Date Acquired	Date Disposed	Life Months	Dep. Metho	Original Cost	Accum Amort.	Net Book Value
Dollar amount redacted.									
00070 070 West Palm	04/01/00								
2050 Fixtures & Equipment									
00073082	00073082 NEC ELECTRA ELITE 192	70	04/30/00		60	01			
00074270	00074270 Yard signs	70	05/19/00		60	01			
00083467	00083467 CUBICLES	70	02/28/01		60	01			
00083504	00083504 OFFICE FURNITURE	70	02/28/01		60	01			
00083512	00083512 FUEL TANK & PUMP	70	02/28/01		60	01			
2050 Fixtures & Equipment					300	01			
Dollar amount redacted.									
2055 Fixtures & Equipment Maint									
00112846	00112846 FURNITURE	70	07/22/03		60	01			
00113620	00113620 PHONE SYSTEM CABLING-NEW BLD	70	08/14/03		60	01			
00128207	00128207 ADP TIME CLOCK	70	07/31/04		60	01			
2055 Fixtures & Equipment Maint					180	01			
Dollar amount redacted.									
2060 Yard Equipment									
00130956	00130956 DIESEL TANK	70	01/12/05	04/30/07	60	01			
2060 Yard Equipment					60	01			
Dollar amount redacted.									
2320 Goodwill/Customer List									
00071933	00071933 Purchase of TDP, Inc (License	70	03/01/00		480	00			
2320 Goodwill/Customer List					480	00			
Dollar amount redacted.									
00070 070 West Palm	04/01/00				4,212	00			
Dollar amount redacted.									

Dollar amount redacted.

Dollar amount redacted.

Dollar amount redacted.

Dollar amount redacted.

Dollar amount redacted.

Dollar amount redacted.